



**US Army Corps
of Engineers®**

Pittsburgh District

August 2006

**Draft
Detailed Project Report
And
Integrated Environmental Assessment**

**APPENDIX 8
CULTURAL RESOURCES**

**North Park Lake
Allegheny County, PA
Section 206 Aquatic Ecosystem
Restoration Project**

November 21, 2002

Natural & Cultural
Resources Section

Mr. Chan Funk
Division of Archaeology and Protection
Bureau for Historic Preservation
Commonwealth Keystone Building, 2nd Floor
400 North Street
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17120-0093

Dear Mr. Funk:

The Pittsburgh District is proposing to conduct a Section 206 Ecosystem Restoration Project at North Park Lake, McCandless Township, Allegheny County, Pennsylvania (Figure 1). North Park is an Allegheny County facility and the County will be a cost share partner with the District. The project will result in significant quantities of dredged material for disposal. The scope of the project calls for this material to be disposed of within the park boundaries. However, there are very limited options for the placement of the large quantity of materials expected. Figure 1 shows the areas proposed for fill placement and staging areas. While it may be possible to move the staging areas, the sites chosen for the placement of the dredged materials are the only options available to the District.

As the District's Archeologist, I have reviewed the Pennsylvania Archaeological Site Survey (P.A.S.S.) files at the Carnegie Museum of Natural History, Department of Anthropology in relation to the North Park project areas. These files showed that North Park had been surveyed by the Carnegie in 1979 resulting in the identification of several archeological sites. However, not much information about the sites was recorded on the P.A.S.S. forms. According to the current staff at the Carnegie, no report on the survey was ever produced.

Figure 1 shows the District's project areas and the sites recorded during the 1979 Carnegie survey. It appears that the vast majority of the park was surveyed by the recorded site distribution. The County Placement Site and the Bull Pen Placement Site are heavily disturbed and altered landscapes. The County Placement Site has been utilized as a disposal site by the park for decades. The Bull Pen Placement Site has been subjected to borrow activities in the past and is now used as a leaf and clean fill storage area. There will be no new disturbances to these areas. The Staging areas are going to be subjected to minimal surface impacts. Although it cannot be absolutely determined that these three staging areas have been previously surveyed, it is our opinion that our proposed use of these areas will not have an adverse impact to any potential archeological property.

The majority of the dredged material will go to the Latodami Placement Site and a smaller portion will go to the Deer Pen Placement Site, as well as the Bull Pen and County Placement Sites. There are no other options for disposal of the materials expected within the park boundaries. As shown on Figure 1, both of these areas have sites recorded during the 1979 Carnegie survey. The following is a description of each site taken from the P.A.S.S. forms at the Carnegie:

Latodami Placement Site - 3 sites are recorded:

- **36AL184 – Wind Mill Site #1** - “This is an extremely weak campsite.” One Lecroy point and flint flakes were recovered by Cummings on May 27, 1979. Field crew surveyed this site on July 9, 1979. Total artifact count = 5.
- **36AL185 – Wind Mill Site** – One point and several flint flakes were found on gentle slope of the hill that was cultivated. The site may be located on the flat ridge above the location producing the cultural material, but at the time of this survey it was not cultivated. The point found on this site was side notched similar to an Otter Creek point. It may be Archaic or Middle Woodland.
- **36AL186 – Wind Mill Site #3** – “This a weak site” - 40 m². One broken side notched point and flint flakes were found from the farm lane, north on the gentle hill slope.

Another site 36AL187, immediately to the northeast of the Latodami Placement site was recorded as a series of camps – 100m² – in a PZ. 2 Brewerton points, flakes and FCR recovered.

Deer Pen Placement Site – 2 recorded sites:

- **36AL178 – Propagation Site (upper)** – The prehistoric component of the site is concentrated on a raise which falls off to the spring run to the west. The historic component is also concentrated in this area, however, is also found on the total field area. A building was located at one time north of the site and between site 36AL179. Several of the lithic tools from the site may be Paleo Indian. 200m E-W x 100m N-S
- **36AL179 – Propagation Site (lower)** – Several Archic points, flint flakes, and firestone was found in the western end of the field.

The area indicated by circle on the quad map does not come that close to the stream to include AL179, however, the drawing indicates it will encompass at least a part of it.

The District cannot avoid these recorded sites as every one of the placement sites will have to be filled to it's maximum safe capacity in order to complete the project. In light of the District's inability to move and avoid, coupled with the sparse information available on the recorded sites, the District proposes to concentrate our Section 106 efforts on relocating and re-evaluating the five recorded sites within the two placement areas.

The entire Latodami Placement Site has been cultivated in the past but there is no indication that the same is true of the Deer Pen Placement Site. The District will conduct a subsurface investigation of the Deer Pen Placement Site through the excavation of shovel test units on a 10 m interval grid over the entire 5 acre impact area in order to re-locate both archeological sites, 36AL178 and 36AL179. In addition, a maximum of 10 1m² test units will be

utilized to address the potential significance of these two sites. These 10 test units will be divided between the two sites based on the results of the shovel testing component.

Because the Latodami Placement Site has been plowed in the past, the District proposes to have the area plowed and disked in strips allowing for at least 50% visibility for conducting a pedestrian reconnaissance in an attempt to relocate Sites 36AL184, 36AL185, and 36AL186. The information available for Sites 36AL184 and 36AL186 indicate small lithic scatters. We propose to supplement our surface survey with shovel test unit excavations at each of the two sites, at a maximum of 5 tests per site. Should these two sites prove to be more substantial than we anticipate, the District will expand the testing to include 1m² test unit excavations to assess the potential significance of these two sites.

Site 36AL185, which is the “strongest” of the three sites recorded within this placement area, will also be subjected to subsurface testing, based on the results of the surface reconnaissance. A maximum of 10 shovel test units will be utilized to supplement site boundary definition and a maximum of 10 1m² test units will be excavated in order to assess the NRHP potential of the site.

The District believes this approach is the best utilization of the available funds while at the same time providing for an extensive assessment of these previously recorded, albeit sparsely represented archeological sites.

As this is a “fast track” project I will e-mail the letter and follow with a fax that will include available mapping. We would appreciate a quick review of the information provided and I will follow up with a phone call as soon as possible to further discuss and refine the work plan as needed. I can be reached at 412-395-7218, usually between 7:30 and 4:00.

Sincerely,

Deborah L. Campbell
Pittsburgh District
Archeologist

-----Original Message-----

From: Campbell, Deborah LRP

Sent: Thursday, February 06, 2003 4:38 PM

To: 'pfunk@state.pa.us'

Cc: Rozzi, Carmen LRP; Moskovitz, Larry R LRP; Cicconi, Craig D LRP

Subject: North Park Lake Section 206 project SOW

Good afternoon Chan.

Attached is a follow up to correspondence I sent to you in Nov regarding the subject project. I have incorporated the suggestions you had for scoping it and wanted to have your blessing on it before I get started on our contracting procedures. We are going to try and use local companies that have current GSA Schedule open end contracts to complete this work.

We had talked about doing a combined Phase I and II study because we already knew sites had been reported but little info was available on them. We also talked about the necessity of quick turn around time on reviewing the Phase I data to be able to move right into a Phase II effort. This is a big concern for the overall project schedule.

Please review this and send comments/changes as soon as you can. We have to get the contracting process started shortly.

I appreciate your assistance.

Also - I got your phone message regarding artifacts from the Fort Armstrong Horseman's Association land transfer to Manor Township, Armstrong County done by IUP. The final disposition of those artifacts is not resolved yet but we are thinking of curating them at the Carnegie. However, I am hearing that this may not be an option. I need to talk with Bev Chiarulli about it. There were organizational problems with the Phase II report as well that I requested they fix for the final report (tables, maps, and descriptions that didn't jive, etc.).

Talk to you soon.

Deb Campbell, Archeologist
USACE - Pittsburgh District
412-395-7218

SCOPE OF WORK
PHASE I AND II ARCHEOLOGICAL INVESTIGATION
NORTH PARK LAKE AQUATIC ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION PROJECT
MCCANDLESS TOWNSHIP, ALLEGHENY COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA

I. BACKGROUND

The Pittsburgh District is proposing to cost share with Allegheny County, Pennsylvania on a Section 206 Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration Project for North Park Lake in McCandless Township. The project will result in significant quantities of dredged material for disposal within the park boundaries. Due to the expected volume of material, there are limited options for the placement of this material. **Figure 1** shows the project location and proposed work/disposal areas on the Emsworth and Glenshaw, Pennsylvania 7.5' U.S.G.S. Topographic Quadrangles.

A review of the Pennsylvania Archeological Site Survey files at the Department of Anthropology, Carnegie Museum of Natural History indicate that much of North Park Lake was surveyed in 1979 by the Carnegie resulting in the identification of several archeological sites. However, not much information is recorded for these sites and no report of these investigations was produced. **Figure 2** shows the location of the sites within the District's proposed disposal sites.

II. PURPOSE

The purpose of this work is to conduct Phase I investigations, as specified below, of the Latodami and Deer Pen Placement Areas in order to relocate and reevaluate, the previously recorded archaeological sites from the 1979 survey, in consultation with the District's Archeologist and the Pennsylvania Bureau for Historic Preservation (BHP). The Contractor will conduct a Phase II level investigation, as specified below, of the sites determined, through consultation, to be potentially eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP).

III. PREVIOUSLY RECORDED ARCHEOLOGICAL SITES

The following information is recorded on the P.A.S.S. forms at the Department of Anthropology, Carnegie Museum of Natural History:

Latodami Placement Area - 3 sites are recorded:

- **36AL184 – Wind Mill Site #1** - “This is an extremely weak campsite.” One Lecroy point and flint flakes were recovered by Cummings on May 27, 1979. Field crew surveyed this site on July 9, 1979. Total artifact count = 5.
- **36AL185 – Wind Mill Site** – One point and several flint flakes were found on gentle slope of the hill that was cultivated. The site may be located on the flat ridge above the location producing the cultural material, but at the time of this survey it was not cultivated. The point found on this site was side notched similar to an Otter Creek point. It may be Archaic or Middle Woodland.

- **36AL186 – Wind Mill Site #3** – “This a weak site” - 40 m². One broken side notched point and flint flakes were found from the farm lane, north on the gentle hill slope.

Another site 36AL187, immediately to the northeast of the Latodami Placement area (Mars, PA Quadrangle) was recorded as a series of camps – 100m² – in a PZ. 2 Brewerton points, flakes and FCR recovered.

Deer Pen Placement Site – 2 recorded sites:

- **36AL178 – Propagation Site (upper)** – The prehistoric component of the site is concentrated on a raise which falls off to the spring run to the west. The historic component is also concentrated in this area, however, is also found on the total field area. A building was located at one time north of the site and between site 36AL179. Several of the lithic tools from the site may be Paleo Indian. 200m E-W x 100m N-S
- **36AL179 – Propagation Site (lower)** – Several Archic points, flint flakes, and firestone was found in the western end of the field.

IV. SERVICES REQUIRED

All work completed under this scope of work is to meet the specific requirements of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation regulations, Protection of Historic and Cultural Properties (revised 1999 - 36 CFR 800); the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards and Guidelines for Archaeology and Historic Preservation, published in the Federal Register, September 29, 1983, volume 48, Number 190; and the Pennsylvania Bureau for Historic Preservation’s (BHP) Guidelines for Archaeological Investigations, July 1991.

Latodami Placement Area

The Latodami Placement Area consists of 28.26 acres of cultivated fields, which are currently fallow. Because these fields have been plowed, the Contractor will have the entire impact area of 28.26 acres plowed and disked for study via pedestrian reconnaissance, following a soaking rain to properly rain-wash the field for better identification of cultural material. Fence lines are to remain intact.

The goal of the pedestrian reconnaissance is to relocate and redefine the previously recorded sites 36AL184, 36AL185, and 36AL186, noted above and to establish site boundaries for these sites, as well as any additional sites located through the Phase I investigation. The Contractor shall conduct a systematic, controlled surface collection over the entire Latodami Placement Area recording isolated finds and concentrations of surface finds to establish site boundaries.

According to the P.A.S.S. forms, Sites 36AL184 and 36AL186 appear to represent small lithic scatters. The Contractor shall supplement the surface survey with the excavation of five shovel test units at each of the two sites, if warranted by the presence of surface finds. Site 36AL185 is the “strongest” of the three sites recorded within this placement area and the

Contractor shall supplement the surface survey with a maximum of ten shovel test units. The placement of these shovel tests are at the discretion of the Contractor, but are to be utilized to further define the site boundaries, horizontally and vertically, and any potential activity areas within the sites.

Within 3 days of the completion of the Phase I fieldwork at the Latodami Placement Area, the contractor shall submit, in writing (hard copy or electronic) a brief (not to exceed two pages) summary report on the results of the Phase I investigation. It is understood that this report will be made based on field counts and distributions of artifacts and field observations of settlement patterns, activity areas, and feature, etc. The results of the pedestrian reconnaissance and shovel testing program will determine the extent of Phase II investigations that are warranted for each site located within the Latodami Placement Area. The Phase II investigation plan will be determined through consultation with the District Archeologist and the BHP. However, for the purposes of this scope of work, the Phase II testing at the Latodami Placement Area shall be limited to the excavation, screening, recordation, and analysis and reporting, of twenty (20) 1 m² test units according to professional standards and all pertinent laws and regulations. Ten of these test units are to be devoted to Site 36AL185. The remaining ten units are to be divided between Sites 36AL184 and 36AL186, or shifted to another site within the project area, upon approval of the District Archeologist. The placement of the test units shall be at the discretion of the Contractor with approval of the District Archeologist. The goal of the Phase II testing program is to assess the NRHP potential of each of the sites located within the Latodami Placement Area.

Deer Pen Placement Area

The District has no information to confirm that this particular parcel has been plowed in the past, therefore the Deer Pen Placement Area shall be investigated through subsurface testing. The Contractor shall excavate, screen all soils, properly record, analyze, and report, shovel test units on a 10 m interval grid over the entire five-acre impact area. Shovel testing at 5 m intervals are to be utilized in order to define the boundaries of a site only. The goal of this testing program is to relocate and reevaluate archeological sites 36AL178 and 36AL179 and to locate and record any additional archeological sites that may exist within the Deer Pen Placement Area.

Within 3 days of the completion of the Phase I fieldwork at the Deer Pen Placement Area, the contractor shall submit, in writing (hard copy or electronic) a brief (not to exceed two pages) summary report on the results of the Phase I investigation. It is understood that this report will be made based on field counts and distributions of artifacts and field observations of settlement patterns, activity areas, and features, etc. The results of the shovel testing program will determine the extent of Phase II investigations that are warranted for each site located within the Deer Pen Placement Area. Phase II studies will be determined through consultation with the District Archeologist and the BHP. However, for the purposes of this scope of work, the Phase II testing at the Deer Pen Placement Area shall be limited to the excavation, screening, recordation, and analysis and reporting, of fifteen (15) 1 m² test units according to professional standards and all pertinent laws and regulations. Ten (10) of these test units will be devoted to Site 36AL178 and the remaining five units, if necessary, are to be excavated at Site 36AL179, or shifted to another site within the project area, upon approval of the District Archeologist. The

goal of the Phase II testing program is to assess the NRHP potential of each of the sites located within the Deer Pen Placement Area.

Mechanical or Hand Stripping

One goal of the Phase II testing is to locate, excavate, and evaluate any cultural features that may be present at any of the located sites. In order to provide the maximum coverage for locating and evaluating features, selected portions of the sites, through consultation with the District Archeologist and the BHP, will be subjected to stripping of the topsoil. It is assumed that the stripping will be completed through the use of mechanical equipment, however, the individual site conditions and consultation shall be the final determining factors between hand or mechanical stripping. The method of stripping will also be a factor in determining how large an area(s) will be stripped at each site.

General

The Contractor can reasonably expect a delay between the Phase I and Phase II excavations of five to ten days while all required consultation is conducted. Each Placement Area can be discussed separately in terms of the summary reports and Phase II plans in order to allow field crews to continue working at one location to the maximum extent possible while this consultation is conducted. The District shall endeavor to make this delay as short as possible.

A goal of the Phase II testing is to determine if these sites are potentially eligible for the NRHP and what, if any, additional investigations may be necessary in the event that the District cannot avoid adverse impacts to the sites. The Contractor shall provide recommendations as to NRHP eligibility as part of the main report of investigations produced under this scope of work. A draft data recovery plan for any site that is potentially eligible for the NRHP shall be included as an appendix to the report.

The Contractor is to be aware at all times that this project area is located within a popular day-use county park and shall conduct themselves in a professional manner. All excavation units that must remain open for extended periods of time are to be completely covered with plywood and are to be cordoned off by appropriate means to promote public and Contractor safety.

V. CONTRACTOR'S RESPONSIBILITIES

The Contractor shall comply with EM 385-1-1, "Safety and Health Requirements Manual", dated 3 September 1996. This manual presents Government requirements to promote worker and public safety in the field.

The Principal Investigator is responsible for the routine administration and coordination required to fulfill the contract obligations to the District. The Contractors' personnel shall be expected to work in close coordination with the Contracting Officer, his authorized representative, or other assigned District personnel.

The Principal Investigator is the person responsible for the validity of the material presented in the report, and in the event of controversy or court challenge, may be called upon to testify on behalf of the District in support of the report findings.

Close coordination between the Contractor and the District shall be maintained during the work. All coordination between the Contractor and others shall be conducted with the approval and/or participation of the District. The District is to receive copies/records of all non-District coordination.

VI. PRODUCT SUBMITTALS

As noted above, the Contractor will submit a maximum two-page summary report on the Phase I investigations conducted at each of the Placement Areas under this scope of work, within three days of completion of the fieldwork at each location. These reports are to be in hard copy or electronic formats.

The Contractor shall submit five copies of the complete draft report that fully comply with the scope of work and appropriate laws and regulations. The District will promptly review the draft submittal to determine its completeness and readiness for submission to the BHP for compliance review. Incomplete draft reports will be returned to the Contractor for revisions. Revised draft reports are due within fifteen (15) days of receipt of comments.

The Contractor shall submit two bound and one unbound, camera ready, copy of the final report that addresses all review comments. These copies shall be accompanied by a floppy disk or CD containing a copy of all electronic/ digital forms, maps, drawings, and reports prepared under this contract. The electronic version shall be formatted on an IBM compatible computer, using Microsoft Word software or in a word-processing software supported by Microsoft Word conversion software.

All reports shall be carefully proofread and edited by the Contractor to be reasonably free of error.

Publishing Restrictions. Neither the Contractor nor his representative shall release or publish any sketch, photograph, report, or other material of any nature obtained or prepared under this contract without the specific written approval of the Contracting Officer or his authorized representative. Records of archaeological site locations are considered to be internal documents and are not for public distribution. All reports, drawings, maps, photographs, notes, and other materials developed in the performance of this contract shall remain the sole property of the Government and may be used on any other work without additional compensation to the Contractor. The Contractor agrees not to assert any rights and not to establish any claim with respect thereto.

VII. SCHEDULE

The Contractor shall begin work upon receipt of the NTP. Due to the weather dependent nature of some work requirements contained herein, the schedule will vary and the Contractor is responsible for close coordination of the schedule with the District's Archeologist, Ms. Deborah Campbell. However, the **draft report required under this scope is to be completed by June 2, 2003 and be submitted to Ms. Campbell of the District's Planning Branch, Natural & Cultural Resources Section for review and comment.** The final report submittals are due within 15 days of receipt of all review comments. Any alterations of this schedule deemed necessary by the Contractor, can be discussed with the District at any time during the life of the contract.

VIII. BILLING AND PAYMENT

The Contractor shall submit monthly invoices with progress reports, of one typed page or less, for partial payments through delivery of the final draft reports, not to exceed 90 percent of the total contract amount. Upon receipt and acceptance of the final submittals the District will authorize payment of the balance of the contract amount.

IX. CONTRACTOR'S QUALIFICATIONS

All work performed by the Contractor shall be under the direct supervision of a person or persons meeting, at minimum, the appropriate qualifications set forth in the Department of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards (48 FR 44738, September 29, 1983). Other personnel as may be needed shall possess appropriate training and disciplinary qualifications.

The Contractor must have professional personnel available for this work who have appropriate training and/or experience to perform the various tasks described in Section IV. **SERVICES REQUIRED.**

X. INSPECTION AND ACCEPTANCE

The District's acceptance of the final report will complete the Contractor's obligations under this scope of work. To be acceptable, the reports should be submitted on an approved schedule, and should completely address all requirements contained in the scope of work and District's review comments.

Figure 1. Location of the North Park Project Area on the U.S.G.S. 7.5' Emsworth and ? Topographic Quadrangles.

Figure 2. Location of previously recorded archeological sites within the Latodami and Deer Pen Placement Areas.

-----Original Message-----

From: Funk, Paul [mailto:pfunk@state.pa.us]

Sent: Friday, February 07, 2003 10:50 AM

To: Campbell, Deborah LRP

Subject: RE: North Park Lake Section 206 project SOW (BHP ER# 2003-0408-00 3-B)

Deb, below are the raw counts from the PASS files for the shed that the project area is located. The consultant should base their eligibility determinations on what they find at all the sites, of course, but also on the existing data. They will have to cull the info they need from doing research here in Harrisburg or at CMNH (I don't know if this is possible out there anymore?). Pete Van Rossum, our GIS guru, can also break out the data from the shed, on a disc he can send you, in an Access database that the consultant can query. Contact Pete (he prefers email: pvanrossum@state.pa.us) for bureaucratic loops that you must jump through to get a data disc. The artifacts will need to come to Harrisburg or an appropriate repository. I don't think CMNH is taking in any new collections. Contact Janet Johnson, curator, (717) 705-0869, to determine if they want them downstairs. This yea or nea will need to be in the Scope before we can OK the work.

Latodami: If they are going to plow and disc and then do a controlled surface collection (plotting artifacts), they may as well do two or three walk overs after rains, time permitting. This will give a better representative sample of what is in the plow zone before any subsurface digging takes place. For the Phase I, I'm not excited by limiting (such a small number) the number of shovel tests prior to identifying the site area, 5 tests on a 2 acre site won't say too much. You might consider several surface collections for the Phase I and then close interval testing and units, if needed, on the Phase II. Or substitute 5 units for the 5 shovel tests on the Phase I per site. I'm not sure what CMNH did here in the 70's but I'm guessing that you are going to find multiple sites in the 28 acres and not just the 2 known areas. You might include a provision for consultation if this occurs. I agree we should consult on any Phase II work, if needed. Again, I'm not excited by limiting numbers of units up front as you may have multiple resources on your hands when the surface collection is completed. But, if all goes as scoped, that will be fine. Just make sure they test site areas sufficiently (at least 10%) to determine eligibility, and place the data in the shed context, so we don't have to request more work after we get the report.

Deer Pen: I would think that Deer Pen has been plowed, maybe a county soil guru could tell you, as the shovel tests will spike your cost for the Phase I. Several surface collections and a few units would suffice. You may turn up several additional resources in this area as well and a consultation provision should be included in the Scope. I agree on consultation for any Phase II work plans.

Let me know, Best, Chan

(18) Lower Allegheny River: Watershed A

Sites in watershed	180
Datable prehistoric sites	65
Upland datable sites	33
Prehistoric sites with features	15
Stratified datable prehistoric sites	5
Historic sites	55

Cc: ER File 2003-0408-003-B

-----Original Message-----

From: Funk, Paul [mailto:pfunk@state.pa.us]

Sent: Friday, February 07, 2003 2:19 PM

To: 'Campbell, Deborah LRP'

Subject: RE: North Park Lake Section 206 project SOW

Deb, I should mention that 36AL187, located northeast of latadomi along Pine Creek, was just tested and is eligible for the register. The project is the New Community Church, requiring a COE permit. There were approx 80 points recovered spanning the woodland period, one feature, and several post molds. We are going to ask for avoidance or Phase III. Chan